

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
)
vs.) NO. 04-30034-MAP
)
MICHAEL CROOKER)

**AFFIDAVIT RESPECTING WYATT DETENTION FACILITY WIRETAPS AND
IMPLIED CONSENT**

1. I was the lead plaintiff in the Title III Class Action Wiretap lawsuit against Danbury Federal Prison's telephones. Crooker v. U.S. Department of Justice, 497 F. Supp. 500 (D. Conn. 1980). The impetus for this lawsuit was an individual, I then knew as Frank Campiti, who has successfully sued over a Walpole Prison intercepted telephone call. Campiti v. Walonis, 611 F.2d 387 (1st Cir. 1979). I knew from Campiti's case, and successfully argued in mine, that no valid consent existed . . . when there is a telephone monopoly, no alternative exists for using other phones, and an individual is forced to use a particular phone or no phone at all, there is no consent.
2. I did not consent to Wyatt privateers intercepting my phone calls. I know from my 30-year study of law that Wyatt staff are mere private security guards and not investigative or law enforcement officers. I know that, for this reason, the Danbury guards could intercept telephone calls, but the Wyatt guards legally could not, despite any forced consent notices.
3. Most detainees at Wyatt , including myself, knew that Wyatt's private staff had no law enforcement status and believed, or suspected that the telephone warnings were bluffs to dissuade drug deals and criminal activity over the phones, and that actual recording probably did not occur.

Signed under the pains and penalties of perjury this 13 day of January 2006.

/s/ Michael Crooker